IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3. Item 344 in Figure 3 has been changed to correct a minor typographical error. Applicants respectfully submit that the correction does not introduce new matter.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet
                Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated December 8, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 8, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Claims 1-37 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1, 8-9, 13-14, 17-20, 22-29 and 31-37 have been amended for clarification. Claims 7, 21 and 30 have been cancelled, and the subject matter from the cancelled claims has been added to amended claims 1, 18 and 23, respectively. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 18-22 and 23-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended for clarification. Claims 18-22 have been amended to recite a computer-readable storage medium. Claim 30 has been cancelled. Claims 23-29 and 31-37 have been amended to describe hardware components of a computer system. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 17 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner asserts that the claims contain subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the specification does not support a primary state, subsequent state or subsequent halted position.

With respect to the description of a primary state, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify that the state being referenced in the claims is a main state as described in the specification at Pg. 16, Paragraph 0054. With respect to the terms "subsequent state" and "subsequent halted position", Paragraph 0054 describes a debug history record being created after a stoppage that has occurred as described at Pg. 14-15, Paragraph 0050, and Pg. 17, Paragraph 0057 describes an exemplary stoppage occurring "*several weeks later*", *e.g.,* at a subsequent time from the stoppage mentioned in Paragraph 0050. Accordingly, the exemplary state described in Paragraph 0057 is a subsequent state with respect to the state described in Paragraph 0054. Similarly, the stoppage at the portion of code described in Paragraph 0057 is a "subsequent halted position" with respect to the stoppage described in Paragraph 0054. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification does support the claims' recitation of a main state, subsequent state and subsequent halted position. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

<u>Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102</u>

Claims 1-21, and 23-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Bates et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,096,458, hereinafter, "*Bates*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

First, Applicants note that the cited reference, *Bates,* was not issued as a patent until August 22, 2006. The present application was filed on January 30, 2004. Accordingly, under 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(b), the cited reference was not "<u>patented</u> or described in a printed publication <u>in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States.</u>"

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as

is contained in the... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Further, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicants respectfully submit that *Bates* does not describe each and every element as set forth in the pending claims. For example, with respect to the amended claims, Applicants submit that *Bates* does not describe providing an indication of a match to a user via the one or more interfaces whereby the user is allowed to view debug information contained in a history record corresponding to the match, the debug information describing at least an aspect of the previously-encountered given state, *wherein the given state of the code is defined at least in part by an evaluation of a variable by a command which is separate from the code, the evaluation having been performed at the request of the user at the halted position* as recited in Claims 1, 9, 18, and 23.

The Examiner cites *Bates* at Col. 9, Line 23 as describing that "the given state of the code is defined at least in part by an evaluation of a variable" and Col. 8, Lines 13-14 as describing "the evaluation having been performed at the request of the user at the halted position". *See Office Action dated December 8, 2006,* Page 7.

With respect to the first cited section (*Bates* at Col. 9, Line 23), the section describes a monitored expression. *See Bates,* Col. 9, Lines 19-30. A monitored expression is a computer language expression and the location at which the expression is evaluated. *See id.* The cited section states that the monitored expression is watched and compared during a debug session. *See id.* With respect to the second cited section (*Bates* at Col. 8, Lines 13-14), the second cited section merely describes a debugger which looks at scenarios to determine which ones best match and, at the user's request, displays information relating to the best matching scenarios. *See Bates* at Col. 8, Lines 9-15. Thus, the second cited section merely describes a user request to display information related to matching scenarios. *See id.* The second cited section does not refer to monitored expressions, nor does the second cited section indicate that a monitored expression is entered by a user as suggested by the Examiner. *See id.*

Therefore, as described above, the cited sections merely indicate that a monitored expression is a computer language expression which is monitored during a debug session. *Bates* does not state that the monitored expression is an "evaluation having been performed at the request of the user at the halted position" as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Bates* does not describe "providing an indication of a match to a user via the one or more interfaces whereby the user is allowed to view debug information contained in a history record corresponding to the match, the debug information describing at least an aspect of the previously-encountered given state, wherein the given state of the code is defined at least in part by an evaluation of a variable by a command which is separate from the code, the evaluation having been performed at the request of the user at the halted position."

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 1, 9, 18, and 23 as well as their dependents are allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, with respect to claims 13-14, 28-29, and 32-33, Applicants further submit that *Bates* does not describe "the debug information comprises user commentary entered by the user as text using a text box." Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 13-14, 28-29 and 32-33 are allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bates* in view of *Novik et al* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,367,034, hereinafter "*Novik*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner's rejection of Claim 22 incorporates the Examiner's rejection of Claim 18 from which claim 22 depends in view of *Bates*. As described above, the rejection of Claim 18 with respect to *Bates* is believed to be overcome. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 22 is also believed to be overcome. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 22 is allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

<u>Conclusion</u>

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/
Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants

543296_1.DOC